Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

against him. *Louisville, Albany & Chicago R. R. v. Wright,* 115 Ind. 378. Adversely as to the compromise admitting liability and endeavoring to settle, an offer of compromise is inadmissible in evidence, but an incidental and independent admission of fact, such as the handwriting of the party, is admissible. *Whitney v. Cleveland,* 13 Idaho 538. However, a letter written by the defendant to the plaintiff, proposing to settle for trespass, is proper evidence to go to the jury that they may determine whether it is an admission of the trespass or only a proposition to buy the plaintiff's peace. *Trussel v. Knowles,* 5 Miss. 90.

INJUNCTION—NUISANCE—SUNDAY BASEBALL.—MCMILLAN V. KUEHNLE, 73 ATL. 1054 (N. J.).—*Held,* that the playing of baseball on Sunday will be enjoined if it be made to appear that the noise and disorderly conduct attendant upon the games amounts to a nuisance in the neighborhood, whereby the peace and quiet of Sunday is disturbed, and the rest which the complainants are entitled to enjoy on that day is appreciably affected.

The general ruling has been that the public has the right of enjoying Sunday as a day of rest, free and clear of all disturbance from unnecessary and unallowed worldly employment. *Commonwealth v. Scully,* 35 Pa. (11 Casey) 511; *Clough v. Shepherd,* 31 N. H. 490. So that in cases of public nuisances a petition for an injunction can be maintained by an individual because of special damage peculiar to himself and distinct from that done to the public at large. *Allen v. Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Monmouth,* 13 N. J. Eq. 68. To warrant the allowance of an injunction, however, it must clearly appear that some act has been done which will produce irreparable injury to the party asking an injunction. *Vaughan v. Bowie,* 30 Ark. 278. And an injury is considered irreparable when the party injured cannot be adequately compensated, or when the damages resulting cannot be measured by any certain pecuniary standard. *Kerlin v. West,* 4 N. J. Eq. 449. Hence, owners of land adjoining an inclosed ground, to which admission is charged to see baseball games, which are a detriment to the peace of the Sabbath, may obtain an injunction, though several years, before the ground was fenced off, persons had played ball there on Sunday. *Seastream v. New Jersey Exposition Co.,* 67 N. J. Eq. 178. Also the noise caused by the shouts, cheers and stamping of feet of spectators at Sunday ball games, even though constituting a public nuisance, will be enjoined at the suit of individuals living in the neighborhood, it being such as to appreciably disturb their rest and quiet. *Gilbough v. West Side Amusement Co.,* 64 N. J. Eq. 27. Again a court of equity has jurisdiction to protect by injunction a dwelling house against a nuisance occasioned by the playing of Sunday baseball, which renders the house uncomfortable, though the existence of such a nuisance is disputed at law. *Cronin v. Bloemecke,* 58 N. J. Eq. 313.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS—SALES ON SUNDAY—LIABILITY—SALE BY AGENT—EVIDENCE OF AUTHORITY—LIABILITY OF PRINCIPAL FOR SALE BY AGENT.—OLLRE *v.* STATE, 123 S. W. 1116 (TEX.)—*Held,* that under Act 30th Leg., p. 266, c. 138, sect. 19, punishing every liquor dealer knowingly